

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,513	10/07/2003	Brad M. Baber	1576-0082	5034
7590 02/22/2006			EXAMINER	
Paul J. Maginot			MILLER, BENA B	
Maginot, Moor	e & Beck			
Bank One Center/Tower			- ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3000			3725	
Indianapolis, IN 46204-5115			DATE MAILED: 02/22/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Cummans	10/680,513	BABER, BRAD M.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Bena Miller	3725			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tire will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□ This	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 10-31 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 10-26 and 29-31 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 13,21,27 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11).	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
	<i>/</i>				
Attachment(s)    Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	(PTO-413) ate atent Application (PTO-152)			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 10-25 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 10 and 20, the examiner is unsure if applicant is claiming the combination of the support assembly and the hand-held power tool or the subcombination of support assembly, only. This in turn, is because while line 1 of the claim appears to indicate that applicant's intention is to claim only the support assembly, other portions of the claims recite limitations which are dependent on the hand-held power tool (Note claim 1, line 10, <u>for example only</u>). In this Office Action, the examiner presumes that the applicant's intention is to prosecute the subcombination of the support assembly, in order that the claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation. Accordingly, all additional limitations that are dependent on the hand-held power tool are not considered further structurally limiting with respect to the claimed device.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Application/Control Number: 10/680,513 Page 3

Art Unit: 3725

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-12, 14-20, 22-26 and 28-31 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanders (US Patent 4,445,811) or Zelik (US Patent 3,447,001) in view of Seely et al (US Patent 3,811,361).

Sanders or Zelik teaches most of the elements of the claimed invention.

However, Sanders or Zelik may fail to teach a nut defining an internally threaded bore extending therethrough, rotatably supported in relation the receptacle of the carriage.

Seely teaches a support assembly having a carriage with a receptacle and a nut (fig.4) rotatably supported in relation to the receptacle. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a nut as suggested by Seely in the device of Sanders or Zelik for the purpose of providing a tightening of a bit and loosening to change, remove or replace the bit.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 13, 21 and 27 are finally objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/680,513 Page 4

Art Unit: 3725

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bena Miller whose telephone number is 571.272.4427. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bena Miller

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3725

bbm

February 19, 2006